Who's Filibustering at Geneva? P. 3

Calling for A National Conference in December to End Minority Rule of Congress, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 40 NOVEMBER 7, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why We Cannot Recommend Either Candidate

Speaking of prestige, as Kennedy does daily, U.S. prestige has hardly been advanced by the character of the campaign. The American two party system never looked more monolithic; it has often been as difficult to distinguish the real differences between the two parties as it is to choose between Ivory and Sweetheart soap. The phoney smell of advertising copy has hung over the prepared scripts, and there have been times when it seemed to be a beauty contest. Kennedy *is prettier than Nixon but Lodge is handsomer than Johnson* while Jackie clearly has it all over Pat; this election is as apt to be decided by a hair-do as by a hair.

What Really Hurts Our Prestige

Perhaps the most distasteful aspect of the campaign has been the constant yack, and daily leaks of secret reports, about U.S. prestige; our country has been made to resemble a fat lady constantly watching herself on the bathroom scales. Ours is a great country with great traditions, temporarily fallen under mediocre leadership; prestige is not acquired by constantly reprimping ourselves in the mirror of public opinion. Those who have seen the grimy gloom and flavored the leaden intellectual atmosphere of the Soviet Union know that this talk of our being secondary is premature to say the least. What really hurts U.S. prestige in Western Europe and the uncommitted countries more than sputnik is the inability of their leaders to talk sense with Americans. Whereas they are dealing with real problems in a real world, Americans tend to live in a nightmarish realm where the one problem is to evade that red bogeyman over there—*can't you even see him?*—in that dark corner. Our politics have but two primary colors—white or red. To have a bright young man like Kennedy lumping together situations as diverse as Ghana, Guinea, Laos and Cuba has not helped the prestige about which he is so concerned. How, people abroad ask themselves, can you talk sense with such hysterics?

Next to prestige, the most important word in the Kennedy campaign has been growth. But it is evident that we need growth in our ideas more than in our economy. How can we fulfill our obligations to the world, how can we utilize the leadership our wealth and strength give us, if our stock of common political ideas remains so meagre, so narrow and so nationalistic? Presidential campaigns are not merely occasions for competition in pandering to vulgar prejudices. They can be occasions for genuine public debate and education. They were under Wilson and Roosevelt. Kennedy's campaign gives one the impression of being run by technicians who repeat key words on the basis of decibel response.

Why the Air Force Prefers Kennedy

"Senator Kennedy's advisers [on defense] have been chiefly, though not exclusively, associated with the Air Force, which has advocated the kind of sweeping reorganization the Senator has urged. Indeed it would appear that the Air Force has hitched its fortunes to the hope and expectation of a Democratic victory. . . . Senator Kennedy . . . has put himself on the side of the military 'realists.' His election would seem to mean major changes and a larger defense budget.

"Mr. Nixon, while he promises to maintain U. S. military primacy, is more conservative in his organizational and budgetary views. . . . Mr. Nixon says that 'while we do have the power to destroy Russia or China if world war should start, I want to emphasize this doesn't mean we can rest on our laurels.'"

—Hanson W. Baldwin in New York Times Nov. 2.

Of the two candidates, however, Mr. Nixon is clearly better at mixing metaphors.

Particularly on Cuba, Kennedy has been cheap, demogogic and irresponsible. How can he make sensible policy when he imprisons himself in advance in his oversimplified stereotypes?

If we regarded the two young men merely as functions of their respective parties, then it would seem a little safer to return the Republicans to power; they are more cautious, less adventuristic, not as eager to spend on the arms race, and unlike the Democrats they do not need to be twice as belligerent toward Moscow to prove they are not secretly Communist. But the shallow Nixon, who was so ready for war over Indochina in 1954, how could one possibly vote for him? Yet it is impossible to look at the shopworn collection of cold warriors whom Kennedy has chosen for his post-election advisers and recommend a vote for him either.

The lessons that we and all the peoples of the earth must *learn have found no echo in this campaign.* No one has said that we humans must become one family or perish. No one has said that we Americans for our own good must realize that socialism is a necessity for the backward regions of the earth, and that private business can survive only by working with the trend. No one has said that the arms race which squanders our substance is a crime against the swarming poor on this planet. And neither candidate, in this country which talks so much about freedom, has emphasized the need to stop its steady erosion at home, to slow up the steam rollers of conformity which continue to flatten out the home of the free and the land of the brave.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democratic Reform Promises Can Be Blocked by Strategically Placed Conservatives

Calling for A National Conference to End Minority Rule of Congress

Assuming a Kennedy victory, the No. 1 political task on the home front is reform of Congressional procedures to end minority rule of Congress. Otherwise the liberal promises of the Democratic platform can again be frustrated by strategically placed Southern conservatives. It would be wise now to recall the disillusion which followed the liberal victories in the 1958 Congressional elections when the new men proved powerless on Capitol Hill. A bitter awakening on a larger scale may follow a Kennedy victory unless pressure is built up promptly for changes in the rules. It will be too late if liberals wait until Congress meets. We suggest:

Kennedy and Johnson Still Silent

(1) That in the closing days of the campaign liberal editors and reporters try to smoke out Kennedy and Johnson. Senator Mansfield, who will succeed Johnson as majority leader, and is next in line for chairmanship of Senate Rules Committee, has already indicated (see adjoining box) that the leadership is not taking seriously the pledges made by the Democratic platform. Nixon in one speech made a friendly gesture to the House Rules Committee without eliciting any protest from Kennedy. Senators Humphrey, Clark and Douglas recently sent Kennedy a wire asking him to make clear where he stands on rules reform and the filibuster and serving notice that they will introduce a measure for a cut-off by majority vote after reasonable debate. Neither this nor a similar questionnaire to Kennedy by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has yet been answered.

(2) That liberal and labor organizations interested in civil rights, education, housing, depressed areas, and other social reform issues hold a National Conference to End Minority Rule of Congress in Washington next month. The purpose would be to focus attention on the rules which give conservatives control of both houses. An excellent introduction to the subject is a pamphlet which can be obtained from the office of Senator Joseph S. Clark (D. Pa.), containing the texts of two able speeches he made on the subject last summer and of the ten bills he introduced for reforming the rules of the Senate. These would end not only the filibuster but various foot-dragging procedures resorted to by recalcitrant minorities. In addition he would end practices which enable committee chairmen to act as dictators and give key posts on conference committees to members hostile to the majority opinion of the Houses they represent. Such a National Conference ought also to press for reform of party organization in the Senate which gives the Southern conservatives control of the steering and policy committees, and leadership machinery.

Only a newly elected President has the strength to lead a successful onslaught on the rules. If Kennedy loses the South but carries the election, the stage would be set most favorably for success in this crucial area.

Platform Pledges Already Ignored

"In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve Congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a majority in either house.

"The rules of the House of Representatives should be so amended as to make sure that bills reported by legislative committees reach the floor for consideration without undue delay. . . . To accomplish these (platform) goals will require . . . improved Congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule."

—From the 1960 Platform of the Democratic Party.

Q. Senator Mansfield, would you be in favor of abolishing filibustering and seniority on committees?

A. I would not. I would not. In the first place, I am getting a little seniority; so I would like to see it protected and, in the second place, I think we would have to recognize that there may be other questions than civil rights, such as water resources or urban development or things of that sort in which you might have to filibuster, so I would certainly be in favor of maintaining the filibuster.

—Mansfield (D. Mont.), Senate majority leader if the Democrats win, on Youth Wants to Know, Oct. 16.

How Two House Committees—Rules, and Ways and Means—Hamstring the Senate

"It must be noted in all candor that we in the Senate have legislated throughout the present session in the shadow, not only of the House Rules Committee but of the House Ways and Means Committee. We are continually being told by our leadership . . . that we should neither pass nor insist on the liberal legislation we believe to be necessary to the country's well-being because the House Rules Committee will not permit the bill to go to conference or, if taxes are involved, the House Ways and Means Committee will permit needed taxes and the temporary increased ceiling on the national debt to expire rather than yield to Senate efforts to close notorious and discreditable loopholes.

"Thus the House Rules Committee pickled the Senate-passed depressed areas bill for over a year; and when the House liberals finally, with the assistance of the Speaker, got their less adequate bill on the floor and through the House, we were told that we dare not change as much as a syllable of the House bill—for if we did the Rules Committee would never permit the proposed legislation to go to conference. . . Then came the education bill. Again we were told we dare not include teachers' salaries in the coverage, for the House would not agree and the Rules Committee would block a conference. . . .

"Next came civil rights. For day after day, and night after night, we were told in the Senate we dare not pass an effective civil rights bill, for, if we did, the House Rules Committee would pickle the legislation for the rest of the session. . . . Next came the housing bill. I was told that if I pressed the public housing amendment as I had pressed the teachers' salary amendment to the education bill, the House Rules Committee would find a way to kill the whole housing bill. . . .

"It seems clear to me that the program of the next President of the United States will founder on the rocks of House Rules Committee opposition unless the other body takes steps to change its rules and procedures before the 87th Congress gets down to business."

—Senator Clark (D. Pa.) in the Senate July 1.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Main Issue of A Test Talk Deadline, However, Kennedy Much Like Nixon

Nixon's "Secret Soviet Test" So Phoney Even New York Times Exposed It

AEC Chairman McCone hopes to be Secreary of Defense if Nixon is elected: McCone is a rightist Catholic with "holy war" views. He is opposed to cessation of testing and began leaking hints about "secret" nuclear tests in the Soviet Union months ago to such journalists as Joseph Alsop. McCone inspired Nixon's claim at Toledo that a new seismic station at Fort Sill, Okla., recorded a disturbance in the Soviet Union which "might have been a large underground nuclear explosion." Even the *New York Times*—usually friendly to McCone's views—two days later (Oct. 28) reported that Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Air Force Office of Technical Applications, which is responsible for detecting nuclear tests in the Soviet Union, denied Nixon's story, said the tremor was a large earthquake in the Kamchatka peninsula off Siberia. The *Washington Post* carried the same story from the same official sources the same day.

No Hurry About Improving Detection

The Fort Sill station is a reminder that Pentagon and AEC have been dragging their feet not only in the negotiations at Geneva (see box below) but in carrying out the 1958 East-West technical conference recommendations for a test detection network. The Fort Sill station, recently opened, is the first seismic observatory to be set up under that agreement more than two years ago. Neither Pentagon nor AEC is anxious to prove long distance detection and identification of earth shocks possible and thus smooth the way for a treaty. The Nixon affair showed that through our existing network of ordinary earthquake watching stations we can already identify and locate the larger shocks at vast distances. The Kamchatka quake was placed at 58.4 degrees N. and 161.2 degrees East in the northern part of Kamchatka. If the Geneva talks break down and underground testing resumes on both sides, we will see swiftly expanded detection machinery and new means of long distance identification and location even for small shots.

A Tantalizing Revelation

"I have listened to some Americans, including top-ranking military leaders, who think that we could carry out a secret testing program if we wished to, but I am sure that we as a nation would never countenance such a suggestion if it were seriously proposed." *

—Nuclear Policy for War and Peace, by former AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray (1960), p. 113. Mr. Murray favors resumption of testing underground and in outer space. Without offering any evidence he writes, "My personal opinion is that within the last year the Soviets have carried out underground nuclear tests without our knowledge." By what mystic means they came to his knowledge is not explained.

* This is not reassuring. If the tests were secret, they would never be publicly "proposed".

On the main issue of setting a deadline for the Geneva talks, as on most issues, both sides are close. Nixon trickily spoke of an 80-day deadline to February 1, but qualified this by saying we would then resume tests only for peaceful uses. On weapons testing, he is willing to wait longer but not an "indefinite" time. Kennedy is for "one last effort" but is not for resuming tests "at this time." Even Senator Humphrey, far more knowledgeable than either, is still for a June 1 deadline. Only Humphrey has called attention to our own foot-dragging. Otherwise Nixon and Kennedy alike give the impression that delay in achieving a treaty is due only to the Russians. Kennedy seems more sincere than Nixon in wanting a test ban, but on the record there is not much to choose between them.

Nixon's Filibuster Charge and February Deadline As Seen From Geneva

"In effect, as Mr. Nixon has declared, they (the Russians) have been filibustering against Western efforts to work out treaty arrangements that would provide reasonably effective safeguards. . . ."

—Washington Star editorial, October 28.

"His (Nixon's) verdict that the Russians are 'filibustering' and that the U. S. should impose some kind of 'time-table' for winding up the (nuclear test) talks seems almost totally out of line with the facts as they appear here (in Geneva).

"Fact number one is that the negotiation is still making progress. . . . While the progress may seem exasperatingly slow, it is no slower than that of other successful negotiations, including, notably, the Austrian peace treaty. . . .

"Fact number two is that if anything is bogging down the talks at this stage, it is not the Russians but the American elections. Indeed the question of who is doing the filibustering at this point is a moot one. Since the departure of James J. Wadsworth, the chief American delegate, for the United Nations last month there has been a very noticeable let down in the momentum supplied to the conference from Washington. . . .

"Even before this, however, the question of obstructionism was less clear than American delegation spokesmen would like it to appear. There have been very serious divisions within the administration. . . . THERE IS EVEN A POWERFUL GROUP IN WASHINGTON WHICH WOULD CLEARLY PREFER TO HAVE NO TREATY AT ALL (emphasis added—IFS). . . .

"Thus it happens that a number of vital decisions regarding the treaty have never been made. On the question of nuclear testing in outer space, for example, the basic criteria for a test ban were laid down by the U. S. and accepted by the Russians in July, 1959. But today, 15 months later, there has been no decision forthcoming on the question and no guidance given to the Geneva delegation.

"In the opinion of some highly qualified Westerners, this kind of foot-dragging has delayed agreement on the treaty at least as much as Russian intransigence. They believe that today any serious Western proposals would be met at least halfway by the Russian delegation. And that, if the U. S. had resolved its own doubts, agreements could have been reached long ago.

"Against this background, Mr. Nixon's judgments . . . will cause considerable dismay in Geneva. The inescapable conclusion is that the Vice President (in setting a February 1 deadline) is aligning himself more closely with those who oppose any agreement."

—Crosby S. Noyes, Foreign Correspondent of the Washington Star, from Geneva, same day, same page.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Colonial Front: Behind the Revolt in El Salvador, Mao's Advice to Abbas

Now West As Well As East Growing Hostile to UN in the Congo

CONGO: Now the Western powers are turning against the UN operation in the Congo. *Barron's* (Oct. 31) carried a hostile front page editorial saying "it is reported that the world agency, naively accepting Lumumba's word that he would seek no more aid from the Russians, now has decided to restore him to power." At Leopoldville when the UN troops celebrated the 15th anniversary of the UN, "Ambassadors of the Western powers boycotted the ceremony . . . to mark their displeasure with current UN policy in the Congo" (AP in *New York Herald-Tribune*, Oct. 25). In an editorial Oct. 29 on Hammarskjold's request to Belgium for withdrawal of Belgian military and civilian personnel, *The New York Times* said nervously "It must not happen again "that the West bows to UN decisions, as Britain, France and Israel did in Egypt, while the Soviet defies them as in Hungary." This seems to imply that the West should defy the UN, too, when the UN does not do its bidding. The fact is that the African-Asian neutrals are pressing for restoration of the parliamentary Kasavubu-Lumumba regime, the legal government of the Congo. The Russians are displeased because Lumumba is being pressed to promise he will keep the cold war out of the Congo by not taking Soviet aid outside the framework of the UN. Thus in this three-sided conflict for the future of the Congo, East and West are both discontented with Hammarskjold.

Castro Blamed As Usual

EL SALVADOR: It isn't often that the staid Associated Press sounds eloquently radical. Its dispatch from El Salvador on the overthrow of the Lemus dictatorship said this "little coffee-growing country had been seething for months with demands for social and economic change. The great majority of the 2½ million people are impoverished peasants dominated by a smaller number of wealthy, plantation owning families." The AP quoted the leader of the rebel junta as saying Lemus "harmed the cause of liberty throughout the hemisphere" by "labelling all opposition Communist to justify his iniquities." (*Washington Star*, Oct. 27.) But within a few days Latin American experts operating out of the State Department were seeing "pro-Castro agitators" in the revolt against Lemus, and picturing him as "a well-meaning conservative harrassed for months by persistent disorders." (Virginia Prewett in the Scripps-Howard *Washington Daily News*, Oct. 31.)

Progress of Radicalism in America

"At one point in his speech, [Rep. Edwin E.] Willis [D. La.] said that 'the Communist cells and Communist-front organizations' in America are actually headed by undercover FBI agents."

—New Orleans Times-Picayune quoted in the Washington Post, "Post Scrips," p. 2, Oct. 31.

Rep. Willis is a senior member of House Judiciary and Un-American Activities Committees. His remark may reflect FBI boasting to these committees.

ALGERIA: Some humane anti-terrorist advice seems to have been given Ferhat Abbas, leader of the Algerian rebels when he met recently in Peking with Mao Tse-tung. The London *Observer* (Oct. 30) carries a story based on a full account of the meeting in *Action* (Sept. 28) a French language weekly published in Tunis. Mao, according to this account, promised "full and unconditional aid" but "lectured Ferhat Abbas on the need of presuading and re-educating people opposed to him" saying that the Chinese "never killed a prisoner in their eight-year war with Japan. Disloyal Chinese were captured, re-educated and liberated."

FOOTNOTE ON OUR QUARREL WITH CUBA: A newly released report (*Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply* by the Congressional Joint Economic Committee) finds "waste and inefficiency" in our "duplicative and overlapping" military supply system. It estimates that from two to two and a half billion dollars could be saved *annually* by "a properly organized Defense Department logistic system" in procurement alone. This is more than twice the total value of all U.S. investments in Cuba, which is about $1 billion.

Reprints of Bertrand Russell Issue Still Available for Mass Distribution at Only $2 A Hundred

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/7/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; 6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED